

Specification testing in nonparametric AR-ARCH models*

Marie Hušková,

Natalie Neumeyer, Tobias Niebuhr, Leonie Selk

Department of Statistics

Department of Mathematics

Charles University of Prague

University of Hamburg

October 12, 2016

Abstract

In this paper an autoregressive time series model with conditional heteroscedasticity is considered, where both conditional mean and conditional variance function are modeled nonparametrically. A test for the model assumption of independence of innovations from past time series values is suggested. The test is based on an weighted L^2 -distance of empirical characteristic functions. The asymptotic distribution under the null hypothesis of independence is derived and consistency against fixed alternatives is shown. A smooth autoregressive residual bootstrap procedure is suggested and its performance is shown in a simulation study.

AMS 2010 Classification: Primary 62M10, Secondary 62G10

Keywords and Phrases: autoregression, conditional heteroscedasticity, empirical characteristic function, kernel estimation, nonparametric CHARN model, testing independence

Running title: Nonparametric AR-ARCH models

1 Introduction

Assume we have observations from a one-dimensional stationary weakly dependent time series X_j , $j \in \mathbb{Z}$. Nonparametric modeling avoids misspecification problems and thus such models have gained much attention over the last years, see Fan and Yao (2003) and Gao (2007) for

*Financial support of the DFG (Research Unit FOR 1735 *Structural Inference in Statistics: Adaptation and Efficiency*) and GAČR 15-09663S is gratefully acknowledged. Corresponding author: Natalie Neumeyer, University of Hamburg, Department of Mathematics, Bundesstrasse 55, 20146 Hamburg, Germany, e-mail: neumeyer@math.uni-hamburg.de

extensive overviews. One popular possibility is to analyze data by fitting a nonparametric AR(1)-ARCH(1)-model (also called CHARN-model), i. e.

$$X_j = m(X_{j-1}) + \sigma(X_{j-1})\varepsilon_j, \quad j \in \mathbb{Z},$$

with autoregression function $m(x) = E[X_j \mid X_{j-1} = x]$, conditional variance function $\sigma^2(x) = \text{Var}(X_j \mid X_{j-1} = x)$, and innovations ε_j , independent from past time series values $X_{j-1}, X_{j-2}, \dots$. Before applying any procedure developed for a time series model like the one defined, model assumptions need to be tested. Thus we are interested in testing the hypothesis

$$H_0 : \varepsilon_j \text{ and } (X_{j-1}, X_{j-2}, \dots) \text{ are stochastically independent.}$$

Although testing for this model assumption is essential for applications in order to obtain correct forecasts, it seems that the problem has not been considered before in the literature for the nonparametric case. The reason is presumably that tests for hypotheses involving the innovation distribution would typically be based on the empirical distribution function of nonparametrically estimated innovations (residuals). Only recently, asymptotic results for such processes in nonparametric autoregressive models are available. Müller et al. (2009) consider the above model in the homoscedastic case with constant σ . They prove an asymptotic expansion of the empirical process of residuals obtained from local-polynomial estimation of the autoregression function m . Further, Dette et al. (2009) base a test for the multiplicativity hypothesis $m = c\sigma$ on the estimated innovation distribution. Selk and Neumeyer (2013) consider sequential empirical process of residuals and apply it to test for a change-point in the innovation distribution. In order to test an implication of the null hypothesis H_0 one could consider, for some fixed and prespecified $k \in \mathbb{N}$, test statistics based on an estimated difference of the joint empirical distribution function of ε_j and $(X_{j-1}, \dots, X_{j-k})$ and the product of the marginal distributions. Asymptotic theory could be derived similar to the considerations in Müller et al. (2009), Dette et al. (2009), and Selk and Neumeyer (2013). Note, however, that the assumptions for deriving asymptotic distributions of residual-based processes as in the aforementioned literature are very restrictive. To avoid unnecessarily strong assumptions we follow a different path in the paper at hand and base our test on an estimated weighted L^2 -distance between the joint and the marginal characteristic functions of ε_j and $(X_{j-1}, \dots, X_{j-k})$. In an iid context a test for independence of errors and covariates in nonparametric regression models based on residual empirical characteristic functions was suggested by Hlávka et al. (2011). Relatedly, in a time series context but for a parametric model Hlávka et al. (2012) test for a change in the innovation distribution of a linear autoregression model based on residual empirical characteristic functions. Another motivation for considering the empirical characteristic functions instead of empirical distribution functions is that in other contexts it has been observed that those tests inhabit better power properties, e.g., see Hlávka et al. (2016). A survey of testing procedures based on empirical characteristic functions is given in Meintanis (2016).

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we define our estimators and the test statistic. In section 3 we state model assumptions and give the asymptotic distribution

of the test statistic under the null hypothesis, whereas consistency under fixed alternatives is discussed in section 4. A bootstrap procedure is suggested in section 5, where also the finite sample performance is investigated in a simulation study. Section 6 concludes the paper, while all proofs are presented in an appendix.

2 The test statistic

Assume we have observations $X_{-k+1}, \dots, X_n$ from the time series X_j , $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, considered in section 1. As test statistic for independence of innovations and past time series values we consider the weighted L^2 -distance

$$T_n = n \int |\hat{\varphi}_{\hat{\varepsilon}, \bar{X}_k}(t_0, t_1, \dots, t_k) - \hat{\varphi}_{\hat{\varepsilon}}(t_0) \hat{\varphi}_{\bar{X}_k}(t_1, \dots, t_k)|^2 W(t_0, \dots, t_k) d(t_0, \dots, t_k).$$

Here W denotes some weight function fulfilling assumption (A8) in Section 3. Furthermore

$$\hat{\varphi}_{\hat{\varepsilon}, \bar{X}_k}(t_0, t_1, \dots, t_k) = \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{w}_j \exp \left(i \left(t_0 \hat{\varepsilon}_j + \sum_{\nu=1}^k t_\nu X_{j-\nu} \right) \right)$$

estimates the joint characteristic function of ε_j and $\bar{X}_{k,j} = (X_{j-1}, \dots, X_{j-k})$, whereas

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\varphi}_{\hat{\varepsilon}}(t) &= \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{w}_j \exp(it\hat{\varepsilon}_j), \\ \hat{\varphi}_{\bar{X}_k}(t_1, \dots, t_k) &= \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{w}_j \exp \left(i \sum_{\nu=1}^k t_\nu X_{j-\nu} \right) \end{aligned}$$

estimate the marginal characteristic functions of ε_j and $\bar{X}_{k,j}$, respectively. Here the weights are defined as $\bar{w}_j = w_n(X_{j-1}) / (\sum_{l=1}^n w_n(X_{l-1}))$, where we choose a weight function $w_n(x) = I_{[-a_n, a_n]}(x)$ for some sequence $a_n \rightarrow \infty$. Here and throughout I_A denotes the indicator function of set A . Other weight functions $w_n : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ which vanish outside $[-a_n, a_n]$ are possible as well but require slightly adapted assumptions. The weights are included in the definition of the empirical characteristic functions to avoid problems of kernel estimation in areas where only few data are available. Furthermore the residuals are defined as $\hat{\varepsilon}_j = (X_j - \hat{m}(X_{j-1})) / \hat{\sigma}(X_{j-1})$ and we use Nadaraya-Watson type estimators for the conditional mean and variance functions,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{m}(x) &= \frac{\frac{1}{nc_n} \sum_{j=1}^n K\left(\frac{x - X_{j-1}}{c_n}\right) X_j}{\hat{f}_X(x)} \\ \hat{\sigma}^2(x) &= \frac{\frac{1}{nc_n} \sum_{j=1}^n K\left(\frac{x - X_{j-1}}{c_n}\right) (X_j - \hat{m}(x))^2}{\hat{f}_X(x)} \end{aligned}$$

with kernel function K and sequence of bandwidths $c_n, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Here

$$\hat{f}_X(x) = \frac{1}{nc_n} \sum_{j=1}^n K\left(\frac{x - X_{j-1}}{c_n}\right)$$

denotes a kernel estimator for the marginal density f_X of X_j . See, e. g., Robinson (1983), Masry and Tjøstheim (1995), Härdle and Tsybakov (1997) and Hansen (2008) for properties of these estimators in the time series context.

3 Assumptions and asymptotic results under the null hypothesis

Under the null hypothesis we state the following assumptions. Please note that throughout we write $\mathbf{t} = (t_0, t_1, \dots, t_k)$ and use the notation $g(\mathbf{t})$ for simplicity also for functions g that only depend on $(t_1, \dots, t_k)$ (see e. g. $\psi(\mathbf{t}, x)$ from assumption (A4)).

- (A1) The process $(X_t)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is strictly stationary and α -mixing with mixing coefficient α that satisfies $\alpha(i) \leq Ai^{-\beta}$ for some $A < \infty$ and $\beta > \frac{1+(s-1)(2+1/q)}{s-2}$ for some $q > 0$, where $s > 2$ and $E|X_0|^s < \infty$.

X_1 has bounded marginal density f_X such that for some constant B_1 ,

$$\sup_x E(|X_1|^s | X_0 = x) f_X(x) \leq B_1.$$

Furthermore (X_0, X_j) has bounded joint density f_j and there exists a constant B_2 , such that for some j^* ,

$$\sup_{x_0, x_j} E(|X_1 X_{j+1}| | X_0 = x_0, X_j = x_j) f_j(x_0, x_j) \leq B_2$$

for all $j \geq j^*$.

- (A2) Let m , σ^2 and f_X be differentiable. Let there exist some $r \in (0, \infty)$ such that the functions $m, m', \sigma^2, (\sigma^2)', \frac{1}{\sigma^2}, \frac{1}{f_X}$ and f'_X are of order $O((\log n)^r)$ uniformly on the interval $I_n = [-a_n - Cc_n, a_n + Cc_n]$ (with C from assumption (A5)). Further we assume Lipschitz continuity of the derivatives f'_X , m' and $(\sigma^2)'$ in the following sense,

$$\sup_{\substack{x, y \in I_n \\ |x-y| \leq c_n}} |g(x) - g(y)| = O(c_n (\log n)^r) \text{ for } g \in \{f'_X, m', (\sigma^2)'\}.$$

- (A3) The innovations $(\varepsilon_t)_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are independent, centered and identically distributed. For each $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, ε_t is independent from the past $X_{t-1}, X_{t-2}, \dots$.

For some $\delta > \frac{2}{\beta-2}$ let $E[|\varepsilon_1|^{(2+2\delta)\vee 4}] < \infty$ and $\sup_{x \in I_n} E[|\varepsilon_j|^{2(1+\delta)} | X_0 = x] = O((\log n)^r)$ uniformly in j with r and I_n from assumption (A2).

- (A4) Define $\psi(\mathbf{t}, x) = E[Y_1(\mathbf{t}) | X_0 = x] - E[Y_1(\mathbf{t})]$ with $Y_1(\mathbf{t}) = \cos(\sum_{\nu=1}^k t_\nu X_{1-\nu})$ and assume that

$$\sup_{\substack{x, z \in I_n \\ |x-z| \leq Cc_n}} \sup_{\mathbf{t}} |\psi(\mathbf{t}, x) - \psi(\mathbf{t}, z)| = O((\log n)^r c_n^d)$$

for some $d > 0$ with r from assumption **(A2)** and C from assumption **(A5)**. Assume the same condition holds for $\tilde{\psi}(\mathbf{t}, x) = E[Z_1(\mathbf{t})|X_0 = x] - E[Z_1(\mathbf{t})]$ with $Z_1(\mathbf{t}) = \sin(\sum_{\nu=1}^k t_\nu X_{1-\nu})$.

(A5) The kernel K is a symmetric and Lipschitz continuous density with compact support $[-C, C]$ and $\int K(u)u \, du = 0$.

(A6) For q, s and β from **(A1)** we have $a_n = O(n^{1/(2q)} \log n)$, and for $\theta = \frac{\beta-2-\frac{1}{q}-\frac{1+\beta}{s-1}}{\beta+2-\frac{1+\beta}{s-1}}$ it holds that $\log n = o(n^\theta c_n)$. Let

$$a_n^* = \left(\frac{\log n}{nc_n} \right)^{1/2} + c_n^2,$$

then $a_n^* = O(\Delta_n n^{-1/4})$ with $\Delta_n = \inf_{|x| \leq a_n} f_X(x)$.

(A7) Let the sequence of bandwidths fulfill $nc_n^2(\log n)^{-D} \rightarrow \infty$, $nc_n^4(\log n)^D \rightarrow 0$ for all $D > 0$.

(A8) The weight function W is nonnegative and symmetric such that $W(\pm t_0, \pm t_1, \dots, \pm t_k) = W(t_0, \dots, t_k)$. Further $\int t_0^4 W(t_0, \dots, t_k) d(t_0, \dots, t_k) < \infty$.

Remark 3.1 *Apart from the typical assumptions on the kernel, bandwidths and weight functions we need smoothness assumptions on the unknown functions as well as moment assumptions and the mixing property, e. g. in order to obtain uniform rates of convergence for the kernel estimators, similar to Hansen (2008). Note that for **(A6)** and **(A7)** both to be satisfied one needs $\theta > \frac{1}{4}$.*

We have the following asymptotic distribution of the test statistic under the null.

Theorem 3.2 *Under the assumptions **(A1)**–**(A8)** the test statistic T_n converges in distribution to $T = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{k+1}} S^2(\mathbf{t})W(\mathbf{t}) \, d\mathbf{t}$, where $S(\mathbf{t})$, $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^{k+1}$, denotes a centered Gaussian process with the same covariance structure as*

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{S}(t_0, \dots, t_k) \\ &= \left(\cos(t_0 \varepsilon_1) - E[\cos(t_0 \varepsilon_1)] \right) \left(Y_1(\mathbf{t}) + Z_1(\mathbf{t}) - E[Y_1(\mathbf{t}) + Z_1(\mathbf{t})] \right) \\ &+ \left(\sin(t_0 \varepsilon_1) - E[\sin(t_0 \varepsilon_1)] \right) \left(Y_1(\mathbf{t}) - Z_1(\mathbf{t}) - E[Y_1(\mathbf{t}) - Z_1(\mathbf{t})] \right) \\ &+ t_0 \left(\varepsilon_1 E[\sin(t_0 \varepsilon_1)] + \frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon_1^2 - 1)E[\sin(t_0 \varepsilon_1)\varepsilon_1] \right) \left(E[Y_1(\mathbf{t}) + Z_1(\mathbf{t})|X_0] - E[Y_1(\mathbf{t}) + Z_1(\mathbf{t})] \right) \\ &- t_0 \left(\varepsilon_1 E[\cos(t_0 \varepsilon_1)] + \frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon_1^2 - 1)E[\cos(t_0 \varepsilon_1)\varepsilon_1] \right) \left(E[Y_1(\mathbf{t}) - Z_1(\mathbf{t})|X_0] - E[Y_1(\mathbf{t}) - Z_1(\mathbf{t})] \right). \end{aligned}$$

The proof is given in the appendix. An asymptotic level- α test is obtained by rejecting H_0 whenever $T_n > c_{1-\alpha}$, where $P(T > c_{1-\alpha}) = \alpha$. Due to the complicated distribution of T we suggest a bootstrap procedure to estimate the critical value $c_{1-\alpha}$ in section 5.

Remarks 3.3 (a) *The replacement of true but unknown innovations ε_j by the estimated residuals $\hat{\varepsilon}_j$ changes the asymptotic distribution drastically. Were the true innovations known and used in the test statistic instead of residuals the statistic $\tilde{S}$ in Theorem 3.2 would simplify to*

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{S}(t_0, \dots, t_k) = & \left(\cos(t_0 \varepsilon_1) - E[\cos(t_0 \varepsilon_1)] \right) \left(Y_1(\mathbf{t}) + Z_1(\mathbf{t}) - E[Y_1(\mathbf{t}) + Z_1(\mathbf{t})] \right) \\ & + \left(\sin(t_0 \varepsilon_1) - E[\sin(t_0 \varepsilon_1)] \right) \left(Y_1(\mathbf{t}) - Z_1(\mathbf{t}) - E[Y_1(\mathbf{t}) - Z_1(\mathbf{t})] \right).\end{aligned}$$

(b) *If the aim is to test for independence of innovations and past time series values in a (homoscedastic) AR(1) model*

$$X_j = m(X_{j-1}) + \varepsilon_j,$$

one simply sets $\hat{\sigma} \equiv 1$ in the definition of the residuals. Then the statistic $\tilde{S}$ in Theorem 3.2 changes to

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{S}(t_0, \dots, t_k) = & \left(\cos(t_0 \varepsilon_1) - E[\cos(t_0 \varepsilon_1)] \right) \left(Y_1(\mathbf{t}) + Z_1(\mathbf{t}) - E[Y_1(\mathbf{t}) + Z_1(\mathbf{t})] \right) \\ & + \left(\sin(t_0 \varepsilon_1) - E[\sin(t_0 \varepsilon_1)] \right) \left(Y_1(\mathbf{t}) - Z_1(\mathbf{t}) - E[Y_1(\mathbf{t}) - Z_1(\mathbf{t})] \right) \\ & + t_0 \varepsilon_1 E[\sin(t_0 \varepsilon_1)] \left(E[Y_1(\mathbf{t}) + Z_1(\mathbf{t}) | X_0] - E[Y_1(\mathbf{t}) + Z_1(\mathbf{t})] \right) \\ & - t_0 \varepsilon_1 E[\cos(t_0 \varepsilon_1)] \left(E[Y_1(\mathbf{t}) - Z_1(\mathbf{t}) | X_0] - E[Y_1(\mathbf{t}) - Z_1(\mathbf{t})] \right).\end{aligned}$$

(c) *As mentioned in the introduction alternative testing procedures would be given by, e. g., Kolmogorov-Smirnov or Cramér-von Mises type statistics based on the $\hat{F}_{\hat{\varepsilon}, \bar{X}_k} - F_{\hat{\varepsilon}} \otimes F_{\bar{X}_k}$, i. e. the weighted empirical joint distribution function of $\hat{\varepsilon}_j$ and $\bar{X}_{k,j} = (X_{j-1}, \dots, X_{j-k})$ ($j = 1, \dots, n$) and the product of the marginals. Following Müller et al. (2009), Dette et al. (2009), and Selk and Neumeyer (2013) to derive the asymptotic distribution would, however, require stronger assumptions on the data generating process.*

4 Fixed alternatives

Note that by construction the test statistic T_n cannot detect alternatives where the innovation ε_j is independent of $(X_{j-1}, \dots, X_{j-k})$, but depends on some $X_{j-\ell}$ for $\ell > k$. However, the test is consistent against any fixed alternative

$$H_1 : \varepsilon_j \text{ and } X_{j-\ell} \text{ are stochastically dependent for some } \ell \in \{1, \dots, k\}$$

under the following model. Assume that $(X_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is a strictly stationary and weakly dependent time series that fulfills assumption **(A1)**. Further define $m(x) = E[X_{j+1} | X_j = x]$ and $\sigma^2(x) = \text{Var}(X_{j+1} | X_j = x)$. Let m , σ^2 and the marginal density f_X fulfill assumption **(A2)**. Let the kernel, weight function and sequence of bandwidth fulfill **(A5)**–**(A8)**. Then we have the following result.

Theorem 4.1 *Under the assumptions listed in this section, T_n/n converges to*

$$\tilde{T} = \int \left| \varphi_{\varepsilon, \bar{X}_k}(t_0, t_1, \dots, t_k) - \varphi_{\varepsilon}(t_0) \varphi_{\bar{X}_k}(t_1, \dots, t_k) \right|^2 W(t_0, \dots, t_k) d(t_0, \dots, t_k)$$

in probability, where $\varphi_{\varepsilon, \bar{X}_k}$ is the joint characteristic function of ε_j and $(X_{j-1}, \dots, X_{j-k})$, and φ_{ε} and $\varphi_{\bar{X}_k}$ are the corresponding marginal characteristic functions.

The proof is given in the appendix. Note that under H_1 one has $\tilde{T} > 0$ and hence $T_n \rightarrow \infty$ for $n \rightarrow \infty$.

From rejection of H_0 one should conclude that the AR(1)-ARCH(1) model is not suitable to describe the data. Possible reasons are explained in the following example.

Example 4.2 (a) *Consider the conditional distribution of ε_j , given X_{j-1} . The first two moments of this distribution do not depend on X_{j-1} by construction. Higher order moments could depend on X_{j-1} , i. e. $E[\varepsilon_j^\ell | X_{j-1}] = h_\ell(X_{j-1})$ for some $\ell \geq 3$. In the simulation study we will consider a skew normal innovation distribution with mean zero, variance one and skewness dependent on X_{j-1} .*

(b) *The conditional distribution of ε_j , given $\bar{X}_k = (X_{j-1}, \dots, X_{j-k})$ may still depend on $\bar{X}_k$. If this distribution does still depend on the first component X_{j-1} , but only on this component, modeling the autoregression and conditional variance function with lag 1 is appropriate, but one should not apply any procedures that assume independence of innovations and past time series values.*

(c) *An AR(ℓ)-ARCH(ℓ) model could be appropriate for the data for some $\ell > 1$, i. e.*

$$X_j = \tilde{m}(X_{j-1}, \dots, X_{j-\ell}) + \tilde{\sigma}(X_{j-1}, \dots, X_{j-\ell})\eta_j$$

with innovations η_j independent from $X_{j-1}, X_{j-2}, \dots$.

5 Bootstrap and finite sample performance

In this section we investigate the finite-sample performance of our test by simulations. Due to the complicated limiting distribution of T from Theorem 3.2, we suggest to use a smooth autoregressive residual bootstrap instead. Our bootstrap strategy is as follows.

Firstly, based on the estimators as introduced in section 2, generate bootstrap innovations ε_j^* from a smooth estimate of the innovation distribution, i. e. given the original data $X_{-k+1}, \dots, X_n$ the distribution of ε_j^* reads

$$F_n(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n L\left(\frac{x - \tilde{\varepsilon}_i}{h_n}\right)$$

where h_n denotes a positive bandwidth, L is some smooth distribution function and $\tilde{\varepsilon}_1, \dots, \tilde{\varepsilon}_n$ denote the standardized versions of the residuals $\hat{\varepsilon}_1, \dots, \hat{\varepsilon}_n$. Secondly, compute the bootstrap process via

$$X_j^* = \hat{m}(X_{j-1}^*) + \hat{\sigma}(X_{j-1}^*)\varepsilon_j^*, \quad j = 1, \dots, n,$$

with some starting value X_0^* and a sufficiently large number of forerunnings to ensure the process is in balance. Thirdly, calculate the bootstrap analogue of the test statistic T_n , say T_n^* . Frequent repetitions of these steps give the distribution of T_n^* which approximates the distribution of T_n . By using the $1 - \alpha$ percentile of the distribution of T_n^* , say $c_{1-\alpha}^*$, the hypothesis of independence then is rejected if $T_n > c_{1-\alpha}^*$. It is worth noting that, given the original data $X_{-k+1}, \dots, X_n$, the bootstrap innovations ε_j^* are independent of $X_{j-1}^*, X_{j-2}^*, \dots$ and thus the bootstrap data fulfills the null hypothesis.

The simulations are restricted to the hypothesis 'H₀: ε_j and X_{j-1} are stochastically independent', i.e. only the case $k = 1$ is investigated. To examine the performance of the test for finite sample sizes, we consider the following two AR-ARCH models:

$$(i) \ m(x) = 0.9x, \ \sigma(x) \equiv 1, \quad (ii) \ m(x) \equiv 0, \ \sigma(x) = \sqrt{1 + 0.25x^2}.$$

Obviously, model (i) corresponds to an AR series and model (ii) represents an ARCH model. For both models, the performance under the null and under the alternative is investigated. We distinguish the null from the alternative by the choice of the innovation sequence. Under the null we use standard normally distributed innovations. Under the alternative we choose standardized skew normally distributed innovations, where the skewness parameter depends on past time series values. In particular the skewness parameter of ε_{t+1} was set to $10X_t^2$ for all relevant time points t , according to the notation of Fernández and Steel (1998).

Table 1: Rejection probabilities for the AR model (i) under the null hypothesis (left) and the under the alternative (right).

	$\alpha = 0.01$	$\alpha = 0.05$	$\alpha = 0.1$		$\alpha = 0.01$	$\alpha = 0.05$	$\alpha = 0.1$
$n = 50$	0.0000	0.0275	0.0475	$n = 50$	0.0150	0.0600	0.1125
$n = 100$	0.0000	0.0125	0.0225	$n = 100$	0.0450	0.1375	0.2200
$n = 200$	0.0005	0.0175	0.0425	$n = 200$	0.1550	0.3225	0.5200
$n = 300$	0.0000	0.0200	0.0375	$n = 300$	0.5100	0.7700	0.8675
$n = 400$	0.0000	0.0125	0.0425	$n = 400$	0.8350	0.9525	0.9900

Table 2: Rejection probabilities for the ARCH model (ii) under the null hypothesis (left) and under the alternative (right).

	$\alpha = 0.01$	$\alpha = 0.05$	$\alpha = 0.1$		$\alpha = 0.01$	$\alpha = 0.05$	$\alpha = 0.1$
$n = 50$	0.0075	0.0150	0.0225	$n = 50$	0.0325	0.0900	0.1525
$n = 100$	0.0000	0.0125	0.0325	$n = 100$	0.1000	0.2125	0.2775
$n = 200$	0.0150	0.0325	0.0700	$n = 200$	0.3125	0.4750	0.5275
$n = 300$	0.0025	0.0225	0.0625	$n = 300$	0.4900	0.5750	0.6375
$n = 400$	0.0075	0.0475	0.0825	$n = 400$	0.5575	0.6025	0.6450

Tables 1 and 2 state the rejection probabilities for 400 Monte Carlo simulations each with 400 bootstrap repetitions for several sample sizes n and significance levels α . We chose L as the standard normal distribution, h_n was set to $n^{-1/4}$ for reasons given in Neumeyer (2006),

and the bandwidth c_n was chosen by Silverman's rule by thumb, see Silverman (1986).

The tables show that under the null hypothesis the test yields the given level of significance. While for model (ii) the test performance is very likely, for model (i) the test seems to be somehow over-conservative for the sample sizes used. Under the alternative the test power increases with increasing sample size in both models as to be expected. It is worth to note that the test power increases faster for model (i) than for model (ii). Altogether, the procedure performs satisfying in our simulations, however, it has to be noticed that the test performance depends on the time series at hand.

For practitioners the computation of the test statistic T_n , and T_n^* respectively, might be challenging. For that reason, we suppose using another representation of T_n , and T_n^* , which avoids for solving complicated integrals. The alternative representation is stated in the following lemma.

Lemma 5.1 *Let $\mathcal{F}[V](x)$ denote the Fourier transformation of V at point x . Under Assumption (A8) and if W yields $W(t_0, \dots, t_k) = V_0(t_0) \prod_{i=1}^k V_i(t_i)$, it holds $\mathcal{F}[V](x) = \int \cos(tx) V(t) dt$ and the test statistic T_n can be represented by*

$$\begin{aligned} T_n = & n \sum_{s_1, s_2=1}^n \bar{w}_{s_1} \bar{w}_{s_2} \mathcal{F}[V_0](\hat{\varepsilon}_{s_1} - \hat{\varepsilon}_{s_2}) \sum_{s_3, s_4=1}^n \bar{w}_{s_3} \bar{w}_{s_4} \prod_{j=1}^k \mathcal{F}[V_j](X_{s_3-j} - X_{s_4-j}) \\ & + n \sum_{s_1, s_2=1}^n \bar{w}_{s_1} \bar{w}_{s_2} \mathcal{F}[V_0](\hat{\varepsilon}_{s_1} - \hat{\varepsilon}_{s_2}) \prod_{j=1}^k \mathcal{F}[V_j](X_{s_1-j} - X_{s_2-j}) \\ & - 2n \sum_{s_1, s_2, s_3=1}^n \bar{w}_{s_1} \bar{w}_{s_2} \bar{w}_{s_3} \mathcal{F}[V_0](\hat{\varepsilon}_{s_1} - \hat{\varepsilon}_{s_2}) \prod_{j=1}^k \mathcal{F}[V_j](X_{s_1-j} - X_{s_3-j}). \end{aligned}$$

Since the choice of the weighting function W belongs to the user, the additional assumption on its multiplicative form is very weak. If one further chooses W such that the Fourier transformations of the corresponding functions V_i , $i = 0, \dots, k$, are known, the test statistic T_n can straightforwardly be computed. Even more important, the implementation then simplifies a lot since the computation of the $(k+1)$ -fold integral is omitted.

Example 5.2 *Some choices of W fulfilling the assumptions of the lemma are:*

- (a) $W(t_0, \dots, t_k) = e^{-\gamma_0|t_0|} \prod_{j=1}^k e^{-\gamma_j|t_j|}$, where the Fourier transformation of $V_j(t_j) := e^{-\gamma_j|t_j|}$, $j = 0, \dots, k$, is given by $\mathcal{F}[V_j](t_j) = \frac{2\gamma_j}{\gamma_j^2 + 4\pi^2 x^2}$.
- (b) $W(t_0, \dots, t_k) = e^{-\gamma_0 t_0^2} \prod_{j=1}^k e^{-\gamma_j t_j^2}$, where the Fourier transformation of $V_j := e^{-\gamma_j t_j^2}$, $j = 0, \dots, k$, is given by $\mathcal{F}[V_j](x) = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{\gamma_j}} e^{-(\pi x)^2 / \gamma_j}$.

6 Concluding remarks and outlook

In this paper we suggested a test for independence of innovations and past time series observations in an AR-ARCH model, where both the conditional mean and conditional volatility function are modeled nonparametrically. The test is based on empirical characteristic functions. For simplicity of presentation we considered the AR(1)-ARCH(1) case. However, generalizations to AR(p)-ARCH(p) models are straightforward, while then local polynomial estimators for the mean and variance function should be used. Facing the curse of dimensionality also semiparametric models might be of interest, see e.g. Yang et al. (1999) for a model with an additive autoregression function and multiplicative volatility function. Including covariates is possible as well. Then one considers a model of type $X_j = m(T_j) + \sigma(T_j)\varepsilon_j$, where the vector T_j may include past observations. Testing independence of ε_j from $T_j, T_{j-1}, \dots$ would be of interest here and can be conducted in an analogous manner.

A question related to the one considered in the paper at hand is whether the innovations really form an iid sequence. Corresponding tests for parametric times series models have been considered by Ghoudi et al. (2001), among others. Presumably with the methods developed in the paper at hand, such hypotheses tests for nonparametric time series models can be derived. We leave the consideration for future research.

References

- Dette, H., Pardo-Fernández, J. C. & Van Keilegom, I. (2009). *Goodness-of-Fit Tests for Multiplicative Models with Dependent Data*. Scand. J. Statist. 36, 782–799.
- Fan, J. & Yao, Q. (2003). *Nonlinear Time Series: Nonparametric and Parametric Methods*. Springer Series in Statistics, New York.
- Fernández, C. and Steel, F.J. (1998). *On Bayesian modeling of fat tails and skewness*. J. American Stat. Assoc. 93, 259–371.
- Gao, J. (2007). *Nonlinear Time Series: Semiparametric and Nonparametric Methods*. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton.
- Ghoudi, K., Kulperger, R. J. & Rémillard, B. (2001). *A Nonparametric Test of Serial Independence for Time Series and Residuals*. J. Multivariate Anal. 79, 191–218.
- Hansen, B.E. (2008). *Uniform Convergence Rates for Kernel Estimation with Dependent Data*. Econom. Theory 24, 726–748.
- Härdle, W. & Tsybakov, A. (1997). *Local polynomial estimators of the volatility function in nonparametric autoregression*. J. Econometrics 81, 223–242.

- Hlávka, Z., Hušková, M., Kirch, C. & Meintanis, S. G. (2012). *Monitoring changes in the error distribution of autoregressive models based on Fourier methods*. TEST 21, 605–634.
- Hlávka, Z., Hušková, M., Kirch, C. & Meintanis, S. G. (2014). *Fourier-Type Tests Involving Margingale Difference Processes*. Econometric Reviews.
DOI: 10.1080/07474938.2014.977074
- Hlávka, Z., Hušková, M., Kirch, C. & Meintanis, S. G. (2016). *Bootstrap procedures for on-line monitoring of changes in autoregressive models*. Commun. Stat. Simul. Comput. 45, 2471–2490.
- Hlávka, Z., Hušková, M. & Meintanis, S. G. (2011). *Tests for independence in non-parametric heteroscedastic regression models*. J. Multivariate Anal. 102, 816–827.
- Ibragimov, I.A. & Khasminskii, R.Z. (1981). *Statistical Estimation: Asymptotic Theory*. Springer, New York.
- Masry, E. & Tjøstheim, D. (1995). *Nonparametric estimation and identification of nonlinear ARCH time series*. Econometric Theory 11, 258–289.
- Meintanis, S. G. (2016). *A review of testing procedures based on the empirical characteristic function*. South African Statistical Journal 50, 1–14.
- Müller, U. U., Schick, A. & Wefelmeyer, W. (2009). *Estimating the innovation distribution in nonparametric autoregression*. Probab. Theory Relat. Fields 144, 53–77.
- Neumeyer, N. (2009). *Smooth residual bootstrap for empirical processes of nonparametric regression residuals*. Scand. J. Statist. 36, 204–228.
- Robinson, P. M. (1983). *Nonparametric estimators for time series*. J. Time Ser. Anal. 4, 185–207.
- Selk, L. & Neumeyer, N. (2013). *Testing for a change of the innovation distribution in non-parametric autoregression - the sequential empirical process approach*. Scand. J. Statist. 40, 770–788
- Silverman, B.W. (1986). *Density estimation for statistics and data analysis*. Chapman and Hall, New York.
- Su, L. & Xiao, Z. (2008). *Testing structural change in time-series nonparametric regression models*. Statistics and Its Interface. Vol. 1, 347–366.
- Sun, S. & Chiang, C-Y. (1997). *Limiting behavior of the perturbed empirical distribution functions evaluated at U-statistics for strongly mixing sequences of random variables*. J. Appl. Math. Stoch. Anal. 10, 3–20.

Yang, L., Härdle, W. & Nielsen, J. P. (1999). *Nonparametric autoregression with multiplicative volatility and additive mean*. J. Time Ser. Anal. 20, 579–604.

Yokoyama, R. (1980). *Moment Bounds for Stationary Mixing Sequences*. Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie verw. Gebiete 52, 45–57.

A Proofs: main results

Throughout the proof D denotes some generic positive constant, independent of $\mathbf{t}$, that may differ from line to line.

Proof of Theorem 3.2.

Note that for the test statistic we have

$$\begin{aligned}
T_n &= n \int \left| \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{w}_j \exp \left(i \left(t_0 \hat{\varepsilon}_j + \sum_{\nu=1}^k t_\nu X_{j-\nu} \right) \right) - \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{\ell=1}^n \bar{w}_j \bar{w}_\ell \exp \left(i \left(t_0 \hat{\varepsilon}_j + \sum_{\nu=1}^k t_\nu X_{\ell-\nu} \right) \right) \right|^2 \\
&\quad \times W(t_0, \dots, t_k) d(t_0, \dots, t_k) \\
&= n \int \left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^n \bar{w}_j \cos \left(t_0 \hat{\varepsilon}_j + \sum_{\nu=1}^k t_\nu X_{j-\nu} \right) - \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{\ell=1}^n \bar{w}_j \bar{w}_\ell \cos \left(t_0 \hat{\varepsilon}_j + \sum_{\nu=1}^k t_\nu X_{\ell-\nu} \right) \right)^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \bar{w}_j \sin \left(t_0 \hat{\varepsilon}_j + \sum_{\nu=1}^k t_\nu X_{j-\nu} \right) - \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{\ell=1}^n \bar{w}_j \bar{w}_\ell \sin \left(t_0 \hat{\varepsilon}_j + \sum_{\nu=1}^k t_\nu X_{\ell-\nu} \right) \right)^2 \right] \\
&\quad \times W(t_0, \dots, t_k) d(t_0, \dots, t_k)
\end{aligned}$$

and with the addition theorems for trigonometric functions one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
T_n &= n \int \left\{ \left[\sum_{j=1}^n \bar{w}_j \cos(t_0 \hat{\varepsilon}_j) \left(\cos \left(\sum_{\nu=1}^k t_\nu X_{j-\nu} \right) - \sum_{\ell=1}^n \bar{w}_\ell \cos \left(\sum_{\nu=1}^k t_\nu X_{\ell-\nu} \right) \right) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{w}_j \sin(t_0 \hat{\varepsilon}_j) \left(\sin \left(\sum_{\nu=1}^k t_\nu X_{j-\nu} \right) - \sum_{\ell=1}^n \bar{w}_\ell \sin \left(\sum_{\nu=1}^k t_\nu X_{\ell-\nu} \right) \right) \right]^2 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \left[\sum_{j=1}^n \bar{w}_j \sin(t_0 \hat{\varepsilon}_j) \left(\cos \left(\sum_{\nu=1}^k t_\nu X_{j-\nu} \right) - \sum_{\ell=1}^n \bar{w}_\ell \cos \left(\sum_{\nu=1}^k t_\nu X_{\ell-\nu} \right) \right) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. + \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{w}_j \cos(t_0 \hat{\varepsilon}_j) \left(\sin \left(\sum_{\nu=1}^k t_\nu X_{j-\nu} \right) - \sum_{\ell=1}^n \bar{w}_\ell \sin \left(\sum_{\nu=1}^k t_\nu X_{\ell-\nu} \right) \right) \right]^2 \right\} \\
&\quad \times W(t_0, \dots, t_k) d(t_0, \dots, t_k).
\end{aligned}$$

From assumption (A8) by symmetry properties of cosine and sine we obtain

$$T_n = \int (S_n(\mathbf{t}))^2 W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
S_n(\mathbf{t}) = & \sqrt{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{w}_j \cos(t_0 \hat{\varepsilon}_j) \left[\cos \left(\sum_{\nu=1}^k t_\nu X_{j-\nu} \right) + \sin \left(\sum_{\nu=1}^k t_\nu X_{j-\nu} \right) \right. \\
& \left. - \sum_{\ell=1}^n \bar{w}_\ell \left(\cos \left(\sum_{\nu=1}^k t_\nu X_{\ell-\nu} \right) + \sin \left(\sum_{\nu=1}^k t_\nu X_{\ell-\nu} \right) \right) \right] \\
& + \sqrt{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{w}_j \sin(t_0 \hat{\varepsilon}_j) \left[\cos \left(\sum_{\nu=1}^k t_\nu X_{j-\nu} \right) - \sin \left(\sum_{\nu=1}^k t_\nu X_{j-\nu} \right) \right. \\
& \left. - \sum_{\ell=1}^n \bar{w}_\ell \left(\cos \left(\sum_{\nu=1}^k t_\nu X_{\ell-\nu} \right) - \sin \left(\sum_{\nu=1}^k t_\nu X_{\ell-\nu} \right) \right) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

For simplicity for the moment we consider only

$$S_n^{(1)}(\mathbf{t}) = \sqrt{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{w}_j \cos(t_0 \hat{\varepsilon}_j) \left[\cos \left(\sum_{\nu=1}^k t_\nu X_{j-\nu} \right) - \sum_{\ell=1}^n \bar{w}_\ell \cos \left(\sum_{\nu=1}^k t_\nu X_{\ell-\nu} \right) \right].$$

By a second order Taylor expansion for

$$\cos(t_0 \hat{\varepsilon}_j) = \cos \left(t_0 \left(\varepsilon_j + \varepsilon_j \frac{\sigma - \hat{\sigma}}{\hat{\sigma}} (X_{j-1}) + \frac{m - \hat{m}}{\hat{\sigma}} (X_{j-1}) \right) \right)$$

and introducing the notations

$$\hat{\kappa}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_n(X_{i-1}) \tag{A.1}$$

$$Y_j(\mathbf{t}) = \cos \left(\sum_{\nu=1}^k t_\nu X_{j-\nu} \right), \quad j = 1, \dots, n,$$

we obtain the expansion $S_n^{(1)} = S_n^{(1,1)} + S_n^{(1,2)} - \frac{1}{2} S_n^{(1,3)}$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
S_n^{(1,1)}(\mathbf{t}) &= \frac{1}{\hat{\kappa}_n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n w_n(X_{j-1}) \cos(t_0 \varepsilon_j) \left(Y_j(\mathbf{t}) - \frac{1}{\hat{\kappa}_n} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^n w_n(X_{\ell-1}) Y_\ell(\mathbf{t}) \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{\hat{\kappa}_n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n w_n(X_{j-1}) \left(\cos(t_0 \varepsilon_j) - E[\cos(t_0 \varepsilon_j)] \right) \left(Y_j(\mathbf{t}) - \frac{1}{\hat{\kappa}_n} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^n w_n(X_{\ell-1}) Y_\ell(\mathbf{t}) \right) \\
S_n^{(1,2)}(\mathbf{t}) &= \frac{1}{\hat{\kappa}_n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n w_n(X_{j-1}) \sin(t_0 \varepsilon_j) t_0 \left(\frac{\hat{m} - m}{\hat{\sigma}} (X_{j-1}) + \varepsilon_j \frac{\hat{\sigma} - \sigma}{\hat{\sigma}} (X_{j-1}) \right) \\
&\quad \times \left[Y_j(\mathbf{t}) - \frac{1}{\hat{\kappa}_n} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^n w_n(X_{\ell-1}) Y_\ell(\mathbf{t}) \right] \\
S_n^{(1,3)}(\mathbf{t}) &= \frac{1}{\hat{\kappa}_n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n w_n(X_{j-1}) \cos(t_0 \xi_j) t_0^2 \left(\frac{\hat{m} - m}{\hat{\sigma}} (X_{j-1}) + \varepsilon_j \frac{\hat{\sigma} - \sigma}{\hat{\sigma}} (X_{j-1}) \right)^2
\end{aligned}$$

$$\times \left(Y_j(\mathbf{t}) - \frac{1}{\hat{\kappa}_n} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^n w_n(X_{\ell-1}) Y_\ell(\mathbf{t}) \right)$$

(with ξ_j between ε_j and $\hat{\varepsilon}_j$, $j = 1, \dots, n$). The last term is negligible because

$$\int (S_n^{(1,3)}(\mathbf{t}))^2 W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t} \leq \int t_0^4 W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \varepsilon_i^2 + 1 \right)^2 n O_P \left(\left(\frac{a_n^*}{\Delta_n} \right)^4 \right) = o_P(1)$$

by assumptions **(A3)** and **(A6)**, Proposition B.1 and (B.1). Lemmata B.2, B.3 and B.4 give further expansions of $S_n^{(1,1)}$ and $S_n^{(1,2)}$. With this we obtain altogether that $\int (S_n^{(1)}(\mathbf{t}) - \tilde{S}_n^{(1)}(\mathbf{t}))^2 W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t} = o_P(1)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{S}_n^{(1)}(\mathbf{t}) = & \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n \left[w_n(X_{j-1}) \left(\cos(t_0 \varepsilon_j) - E[\cos(t_0 \varepsilon_j)] \right) (Y_j(\mathbf{t}) - E[Y_j(\mathbf{t})]) \right. \\ & \left. + t_0 \left(\frac{1}{2} (\varepsilon_j^2 - 1) E[\sin(t_0 \varepsilon_1) \varepsilon_1] + \varepsilon_j E[\sin(t_0 \varepsilon_1)] \right) \left(E[Y_j(\mathbf{t}) | X_{j-1}] - E[Y_j(\mathbf{t})] \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Analogously it follows that $S_n = \tilde{S}_n + R_n$, where $\int R_n^2(\mathbf{t}) W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t} = o_P(1)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{S}_n(\mathbf{t}) \\ = & \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n w_n(X_{j-1}) \left[\left(\cos(t_0 \varepsilon_j) - E[\cos(t_0 \varepsilon_j)] \right) (Y_j(\mathbf{t}) + Z_j(\mathbf{t}) - E[Y_j(\mathbf{t}) + Z_j(\mathbf{t})]) \right. \\ & + \left(\sin(t_0 \varepsilon_j) - E[\sin(t_0 \varepsilon_j)] \right) (Y_j(\mathbf{t}) - Z_j(\mathbf{t}) - E[Y_j(\mathbf{t}) - Z_j(\mathbf{t})]) \\ & + t_0 \left(\varepsilon_j E[\sin(t_0 \varepsilon_1)] + \frac{1}{2} (\varepsilon_j^2 - 1) E[\sin(t_0 \varepsilon_1) \varepsilon_1] \right) \left(E[Y_j(\mathbf{t}) + Z_j(\mathbf{t}) | X_{j-1}] - E[Y_j(\mathbf{t}) + Z_j(\mathbf{t})] \right) \\ & \left. - t_0 \left(\varepsilon_j E[\cos(t_0 \varepsilon_1)] + \frac{1}{2} (\varepsilon_j^2 - 1) E[\cos(t_0 \varepsilon_1) \varepsilon_1] \right) \left(E[Y_j(\mathbf{t}) - Z_j(\mathbf{t}) | X_{j-1}] - E[Y_j(\mathbf{t}) - Z_j(\mathbf{t})] \right) \right], \end{aligned}$$

with

$$Z_j(\mathbf{t}) = \sin \left(\sum_{\nu=1}^k t_\nu X_{j-\nu} \right) \quad j = 1, \dots, n.$$

To finish the proof of Theorem 3.2 we apply Theorem 22 (pages 380, 381) in Ibragimov and Chasminskij (1981). In order to verify the assumptions it suffices to show:

- (i) $\tilde{S}_n(\mathbf{t})$ has asymptotically normal distribution with zero mean and finite variance;
- (ii) for any compact set F in $\mathbb{R}^{k+1}$,

$$\sup_n E \int_F \tilde{S}_n^2(\mathbf{t}) W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t} < \infty;$$

- (iii)

$$E|\tilde{S}_n^2(\mathbf{t}_1) - \tilde{S}_n^2(\mathbf{t}_2)| \leq D|\mathbf{t}_1 - \mathbf{t}_2|^\gamma \quad \forall \mathbf{t}_1, \mathbf{t}_2$$

for some $\gamma > 0$ and some $D > 0$;

- (iv) for all $\eta > 0$ there exists some compact set F_η in $\mathbb{R}^{k+1}$ with

$$E \int_{\mathbb{R}^{k+1} \setminus F_\eta} \tilde{S}_n^2(\mathbf{t}) W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t} < \eta \quad \forall n, \quad E \int_{\mathbb{R}^{k+1} \setminus F_\eta} \tilde{S}_n^2(\mathbf{t}) W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t} < \eta.$$

Since $\tilde{S}_n(\mathbf{t})$ is the sums of martingale differences for each t and the central limit theorem for martingale differences can be applied which further implies (i). Direct calculations gives (ii). Concerning (iii) we have

$$\begin{aligned} E|\tilde{S}_n^2(\mathbf{t}_1) - \tilde{S}_n^2(\mathbf{t}_2)| &\leq E\left[|\tilde{S}_n(\mathbf{t}_1) - \tilde{S}_n(\mathbf{t}_2)| \times \left(|\tilde{S}_n^2(\mathbf{t}_1)| + |\tilde{S}_n^2(\mathbf{t}_2)|\right)\right] \\ &\leq \left(E\left|\tilde{S}_n(\mathbf{t}_1) - \tilde{S}_n(\mathbf{t}_2)\right|^2 \times E\left(|\tilde{S}_n(\mathbf{t}_1)| + |\tilde{S}_n(\mathbf{t}_2)|\right)^2\right)^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

and since

$$E(\tilde{S}_n(\mathbf{t})^2) \leq D, \quad \forall \mathbf{t}$$

it suffices to study

$$E\left|\tilde{S}_n(\mathbf{t}_1) - \tilde{S}_n(\mathbf{t}_2)\right|^2.$$

We show here the needed inequality only for one of the terms in $\tilde{S}_n(\mathbf{t}_1) - \tilde{S}_n(\mathbf{t}_2)$ all others are treated in the same way. Particularly,

$$\begin{aligned} &E\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n w_n(X_{j-1}) \left((\cos(t_{01}\varepsilon_j) - E \cos(t_{01}\varepsilon_j))(Y_j(\mathbf{t}_1) - EY_j(\mathbf{t}_1)) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - (\cos(t_{02}\varepsilon_j) - E \cos(t_{02}\varepsilon_j))(Y_j(\mathbf{t}_2) - EY_j(\mathbf{t}_2)) \right) \right)^2 \\ &= E\left(w_n(X_{j-1}) \left((\cos(t_{01}\varepsilon_j) - E \cos(t_{01}\varepsilon_j))(Y_j(\mathbf{t}_1) - EY_j(\mathbf{t}_1)) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - (\cos(t_{02}\varepsilon_j) - E \cos(t_{02}\varepsilon_j))(Y_j(\mathbf{t}_2) - EY_j(\mathbf{t}_2)) \right) \right)^2 \\ &\leq D\|\mathbf{t}_1 - \mathbf{t}_2\|^2 \end{aligned}$$

where we used smoothness of cosine and moment assumptions. Proceeding similarly with other terms and putting all together we conclude

$$E|\tilde{S}_n^2(\mathbf{t}_1) - \tilde{S}_n^2(\mathbf{t}_2)| \leq D\|\mathbf{t}_1 - \mathbf{t}_2\|$$

This implies the item (iii). Item (iv) follows straightforwardly by our moment assumptions and integrability of W .

Combining all the above arguments we can infer that the assertion of Theorem 3.2 holds true; see Lemma 7.1 and proof of Theorem 4.1 (a) in Hlávka et al. (2014) for a similar argumentation. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 4.1.

We use the same decomposition of $T_n = \int (S_n(\mathbf{t}))^2 W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t}$ as in the proof of Theorem 3.2. Please note that Lemma B.1 remains true under the assumptions of Theorem 4.1. A careful inspection of the proof of Theorem 3.2 shows that applying this Lemma one obtains $S_n = \tilde{S}_n + R_n$, where $\int R_n^2(\mathbf{t}) W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t} = o_P(n)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\tilde{S}_n(\mathbf{t})}{\sqrt{n}} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n w_n(X_{j-1}) \left[\left(\cos(t_0 \varepsilon_j) - E[\cos(t_0 \varepsilon_j)] \right) \left(Y_j(\mathbf{t}) + Z_j(\mathbf{t}) - E[Y_j(\mathbf{t}) + Z_j(\mathbf{t})] \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(\sin(t_0 \varepsilon_j) - E[\sin(t_0 \varepsilon_j)] \right) \left(Y_j(\mathbf{t}) - Z_j(\mathbf{t}) - E[Y_j(\mathbf{t}) - Z_j(\mathbf{t})] \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The proof is finished as the end of the proof of Theorem 3.2 applying Theorem 22 (pages 380, 381) in Ibragimov and Chasminskij (1981). To this end, condition (i) is replaced by convergence in probability of $\tilde{S}_n(\mathbf{t})/n^{1/2}$ to

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{S}(\mathbf{t}) &= E \left[\left(\cos(t_0 \varepsilon_j) - E[\cos(t_0 \varepsilon_j)] \right) \left(Y_j(\mathbf{t}) + Z_j(\mathbf{t}) - E[Y_j(\mathbf{t}) + Z_j(\mathbf{t})] \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(\sin(t_0 \varepsilon_j) - E[\sin(t_0 \varepsilon_j)] \right) \left(Y_j(\mathbf{t}) - Z_j(\mathbf{t}) - E[Y_j(\mathbf{t}) - Z_j(\mathbf{t})] \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

for all $\mathbf{t}$, whereas in conditions (ii)–(iv) $\tilde{S}_n$ is replaced by $\tilde{S}_n/n^{1/2}$. Thus we obtain convergence of T_n/n to $\int (\bar{S}(\mathbf{t}))^2 W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t}$ in probability. Note further that by the addition theorems for trigonometric functions and symmetry properties of cosine and sine it holds $\tilde{T} = \int (\bar{S}(\mathbf{t}))^2 W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t}$. This completes the proof. $\square$

Proof of Lemma 5.1.

Using assumption (A8), it follows that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{k+1}} |t_0^4 W(t_0, \dots, t_k)| d(t_0, \dots, t_k) < \infty$ and since $W(t_0, \dots, t_k) = V_0(t_0) \prod_{i=1}^k V_i(t_i)$ by assumption, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \infty &> \int_{\mathbb{R}^{k+1}} |t_0^4 W(t_0, \dots, t_k)| d(t_0, \dots, t_k) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{k+1}} t_0^4 V_0(t_0) \prod_{i=1}^k V_i(t_i) d(t_0, \dots, t_k) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} t_0^4 V_0(t_0) dt_0 \prod_{i=1}^k \int_{\mathbb{R}} V_i(t_i) dt_i \end{aligned}$$

which gives that $V_i \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ for any $i = 0, \dots, k$. Hence, the Fourier transformation of any V_i , say $\mathcal{F}[V_i]$, exists. The representation of the test statistic is now straightforwardly computed by using the definition of the Fourier transformation and of the empirical characteristic functions besides the multiplicative structure of W . Since the computation is tedious but without further insights, this part of the proof is omitted here. $\square$

B Auxiliary results

First note that for $\hat{\kappa}_n$ defined in (A.1) one obtains directly that $E[(\hat{\kappa}_n - 1)^2]$ can be bounded by $1 - F_{X_1}(\frac{a_n}{2}) - F_{X_1}(-\frac{a_n}{2}) = o(1)$ and thus we have

$$\hat{\kappa}_n = 1 + o_P(1). \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Proposition B.1 *Let $(X_j)_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be a strictly stationary time series with marginal density f_X . Define $m(x) = E[X_{j+1} \mid X_j = x]$ and $\sigma^2(x) = \text{Var}(X_{j+1} \mid X_j = x)$ and assume **(A1)**, **(A2)**, **(A5)**, **(A6)**. Let $\Delta_n = \inf_{|x| \leq a_n} f_X(x)$, $a_n^* = ((\log n)/(nc_n))^{1/2} + (\log n)^D c_n^2$ and $b_n^* = ((c_n/n)^{1/2} + c_n^2)(\log n)^D$. Here, $D > 0$ is some multiple of r from assumption **(A2)** and may differ from line to line. We then have*

(i)

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{|x| \leq a_n} |\hat{f}_X(x) - f_X(x)| &= O_P(a_n^*) \\ \sup_{|x| \leq a_n} |\hat{m}(x) - m(x)| &= O_P\left(\frac{a_n^*}{\Delta_n}\right) \\ \sup_{|x| \leq a_n} |\hat{\sigma}(x) - \sigma(x)| &= O_P\left(\frac{a_n^*}{\Delta_n}\right) \end{aligned}$$

(ii)

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{|x| \leq a_n} \left| \frac{1}{nc_n} \sum_{j=1}^n K\left(\frac{X_{j-1} - x}{c_n}\right) (m(X_{j-1}) - m(x)) \right| &= O_P(b_n^*) \\ \sup_{|x| \leq a_n} \left| \frac{1}{nc_n} \sum_{j=1}^n K\left(\frac{X_{j-1} - x}{c_n}\right) (\sigma^2(X_{j-1}) - \sigma^2(x)) \right| &= O_P(b_n^*) \\ \sup_{|x| \leq a_n} \left| \frac{1}{nc_n} \sum_{j=1}^n K\left(\frac{X_{j-1} - x}{c_n}\right) (m^2(X_{j-1}) - m^2(x)) \right| &= O_P(b_n^*) \end{aligned}$$

(iii)

$$\sup_{|x| \leq a_n} \left| \frac{1}{nc_n} \sum_{j=1}^n K\left(\frac{X_{j-1} - x}{c_n}\right) \sigma(X_{j-1}) \varepsilon_j (m(X_{j-1}) - m(x)) \right| = O_P(b_n^*).$$

Proof. The first two results of (i) are stated in Theorems 6 and 8 by Hansen (2008) without the $(\log n)^D$ factor of the c_n^2 term. In comparison to Hansen (2008) we use a different bounding for the expectation terms since we do not assume second derivatives. E.g. we obtain, making use of the mean value theorem, the properties of the kernel function and our assumption **(A2)**,

$$\sup_{|x| \leq a_n} |E[\hat{f}_X(x) - f_X(x)]| = \sup_{|x| \leq c_n} \left| \int K(u) (f_X(x - c_n u) - f_X(x)) du \right|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sup_{|x| \leq a_n} c_n \int K(u) |u| \sup_{\substack{\xi \text{ between} \\ x \text{ and } x - c_n u}} |f'(\xi) - f'(x)| du \\
&= O(c_n^2 (\log n)^r).
\end{aligned}$$

The result on $\hat{\sigma}$ follows similarly to the derivations by Hansen (2008) by noting that $\hat{\sigma}^2(x) = \hat{s}(x) - \hat{m}^2(x)$, where $\hat{s}$ is the Nadaraya-Watson estimator for $s(x) = E[X_j^2 \mid X_j = x]$ based on the observation pairs (X_{j-1}, X_j^2) , $j = 1, \dots, n$.

Towards the results in (ii) we treat only the first one since the others follow analogously. Note that by the mean value theorem

$$m(X_{i-1}) - m(x) = (X_{i-1} - x)m'(x) + (X_{i-1} - x)(m'(\xi_{X_{i-1}, x}) - m'(x))$$

for some $\xi_{X_{i-1}, x}$ between $[\min(X_{i-1}, x), \max(X_{i-1}, x)]$, where the absolute value of the second summand can be bounded by $(X_{i-1} - x)^2 (\log n)^r$ due to assumption **(A2)**. It thus suffices to show

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{|x| \leq a_n} \left| \frac{1}{nc_n} \sum_{i=1}^n K\left(\frac{X_{i-1} - x}{c_n}\right) (X_{i-1} - x)^2 \right| = O_P(c_n^2) \\
&\sup_{|x| \leq a_n} \left| \frac{1}{nc_n} \sum_{i=1}^n K\left(\frac{X_{i-1} - x}{c_n}\right) (X_{i-1} - x)m'(x) \right| = O_P(b_n^*).
\end{aligned}$$

The first relation is straightforward by assumption **(A2)** and applying Theorem 2 in Hansen (2008) with $Y_i = 1$ and the kernel $u \mapsto K(u)u^2$. For the latter one we receive with the same theorem applied with $Y_i = 1$ and kernel $u \mapsto K(u)u$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{|x| \leq a_n} \left| \frac{1}{nc_n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(K\left(\frac{x - X_{i-1}}{c_n}\right) (x - X_{i-1}) - E\left[K\left(\frac{x - X_{i-1}}{c_n}\right) (x - X_{i-1}) \right] \right) \right| \\
&= O_P\left(\left(\frac{\log n}{nc_n} \right)^{1/2} c_n \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Further by direct calculation

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{nc_n} \sum_{i=1}^n E\left[K\left(\frac{x - X_{i-1}}{c_n}\right) (x - X_{i-1}) \right] = \frac{1}{c_n} \int K\left(\frac{x - y}{c_n}\right) (x - y) f_{X_{i-1}}(y) dy \\
&= c_n \int K(z) z f_{X_{i-1}}(x - zc_n) dz = O(c_n^2 \int z^2 K(z) dz \sup_{x \in \tilde{I}_n} |f'_X(x)|) = O(c_n^2 (\log n)^r)
\end{aligned}$$

where we utilize assumptions **(A2)** and **(A5)**.

The result (iii) can be proved in the same way as the results in (ii). Just set $Y_i = |\varepsilon_i|$ for the first and $Y_i = \sigma(X_{i-1})\varepsilon_i$ for the second relation (when applying Theorem 2 by Hansen, 2008) and note that

$$E\left[K\left(\frac{x - X_{i-1}}{c_n}\right) (x - X_{i-1}) \sigma(X_{i-1}) \varepsilon_i \right] = 0.$$

□

Lemma B.2 *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.2 we have*

$$\int (S_n^{(1,1)}(\mathbf{t}) - \tilde{S}_n^{(1,1)}(\mathbf{t}))^2 W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t} = o_P(1),$$

where

$$\tilde{S}_n^{(1,1)}(\mathbf{t}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n w_n(X_{j-1}) (\cos(t_0 \varepsilon_j) - E[\cos(t_0 \varepsilon_j)])(Y_j(\mathbf{t}) - E[Y_j(\mathbf{t})]).$$

Proof. Due to (B.1) we have

$$S_n^{(1,1)}(\mathbf{t}) = (1 + o_P(1))(\tilde{S}_n^{(1,1)}(\mathbf{t}) - J_n(\mathbf{t})J_n^{(1)}(\mathbf{t}) - J_n(\mathbf{t})J_n^{(2)}(\mathbf{t})),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} J_n(\mathbf{t}) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n w_n(X_{j-1}) (\cos(t_0 \varepsilon_j) - E[\cos(t_0 \varepsilon_j)]) \\ J_n^{(1)}(\mathbf{t}) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^n (Y_\ell(\mathbf{t}) - E[Y_\ell(\mathbf{t})]) \\ J_n^{(2)}(\mathbf{t}) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^n Y_\ell(\mathbf{t}) (w_n(X_{\ell-1}) - \hat{\kappa}_n) \frac{1}{\hat{\kappa}_n}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that from assumption **(A1)** it follows that $\beta > 2$ and thus $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (i+1)\alpha(i) < \infty$. From this, centeredness of the summands (under the null) and the boundedness of cosine analogously to the proof of Theorem 2 by Yokoyama (1980) one obtains

$$E[(J_n(\mathbf{t}))^4] \leq D \tag{B.2}$$

$$E[(J_n^{(1)}(\mathbf{t}))^4] \leq \frac{1}{n^2} D. \tag{B.3}$$

The constant D can be chosen independent of $\mathbf{t}$ due to the boundedness of the cosine function. Thus from the Cauchy Schwarz inequality we obtain directly

$$E\left[\int (J_n(\mathbf{t})J_n^{(1)}(\mathbf{t}))^2 W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t}\right] = O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right).$$

Now note that

$$\begin{aligned} J_n^{(2)}(\mathbf{t}) &= (1 + o_P(1)) \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^n Y_\ell(\mathbf{t}) (w_n(X_{\ell-1}) - E[w_n(X_{\ell-1})]) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^n Y_\ell(\mathbf{t}) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n (w_n(X_{j-1}) - E[w_n(X_{j-1})]) \right) \end{aligned}$$

and thus by boundedness of Y_ℓ we have, uniformly with respect to $\mathbf{t}$,

$$|J_n^{(2)}(\mathbf{t})| = O_P(1) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n |w_n(X_{j-1}) - E[w_n(X_{j-1})]| = o_P(1) \tag{B.4}$$

by a consideration of the expectation of the sum due to the properties of the weight function. We obtain

$$\int (J_n(\mathbf{t})J_n^{(2)}(\mathbf{t}))^2 W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t} = o_P(1) \int (J_n(\mathbf{t}))^2 W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t} = o_P(1)$$

by an application of (B.2). $\square$

Lemma B.3 *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.2 we have*

$$\int (S_n^{(1,2)}(\mathbf{t}) - \tilde{S}_n^{(1,2)}(\mathbf{t}))^2 W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t} = o_P(1),$$

where

$$\tilde{S}_n^{(1,2)}(\mathbf{t}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n w_n(X_{j-1}) \sin(t_0 \varepsilon_j) t_0 \left(\frac{\hat{m} - m}{\hat{\sigma}}(X_{j-1}) + \varepsilon_j \frac{\hat{\sigma} - \sigma}{\hat{\sigma}}(X_{j-1}) \right) (Y_j(\mathbf{t}) - E[Y_j(\mathbf{t})]).$$

Proof. Due to (B.1) we have

$$S_n^{(1,2)}(\mathbf{t}) = (1 + o_P(1))(\tilde{S}_n^{(1,2)}(\mathbf{t}) - t_0 I_n(\mathbf{t}) J_n^{(1)}(\mathbf{t}) - t_0 I_n(\mathbf{t}) J_n^{(2)}(\mathbf{t}))$$

with $J_n^{(1)}$ and $J_n^{(2)}$ as in Lemma B.2 and

$$I_n(\mathbf{t}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n w_n(X_{j-1}) \sin(t_0 \varepsilon_j) \left(\frac{\hat{m} - m}{\hat{\sigma}}(X_{j-1}) + \varepsilon_j \frac{\hat{\sigma} - \sigma}{\hat{\sigma}}(X_{j-1}) \right).$$

Now

$$|I_n(\mathbf{t})| \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n (|\varepsilon_j| + 1) O_P\left(\frac{a_n^*}{\Delta_n}\right) = o_P(\sqrt{n})$$

uniformly with respect to t by assumption **(A3)** and Proposition B.1 (i). Thus

$$\int (t_0 I_n(\mathbf{t}) J_n^{(1)}(\mathbf{t}))^2 W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t} = o_P(n) \int t_0^2 (J_n^{(1)}(\mathbf{t}))^2 W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t} = o_P(1)$$

by (B.3).

Further, by (B.4) we obtain

$$\int (t_0 I_n(\mathbf{t}) J_n^{(2)}(\mathbf{t}))^2 W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t} = o_P(1) \int t_0^2 (I_n(\mathbf{t}))^2 W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t} = o_P(1),$$

where one yields the last equality as follows. Similarly to the proof of Lemma B.4 one can first replace the random denominators $\hat{\sigma} \hat{f}_X$ in the definition of I_n by their true counterparts σf_X applying Proposition B.1. Let $\tilde{I}_n$ denote the resulting term, then $E[\int t_0^2 (\tilde{I}_n(\mathbf{t}))^2 W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t}] = O(1)$ is shown by straightforward calculations. $\square$

Lemma B.4 *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.2 we have*

$$\int \left(\tilde{S}_n^{(1,2)}(\mathbf{t}) - \tilde{S}_n^{(1,2,1)}(\mathbf{t}) - \tilde{S}_n^{(1,2,2)}(\mathbf{t}) \right)^2 W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t} = o_P(1),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{S}_n^{(1,2,1)}(\mathbf{t}) &= \frac{t_0}{\hat{\kappa}_n n^{3/2}} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{c_n} K \left(\frac{X_{j-1} - X_{i-1}}{c_n} \right) \frac{w_n(X_{j-1}) \sigma(X_{i-1}) \varepsilon_i}{\sigma(X_{j-1}) f_X(X_{j-1})} \sin(t_0 \varepsilon_j) \\ &\quad \times (Y_j(\mathbf{t}) - E[Y_j(\mathbf{t})]) \\ \tilde{S}_n^{(1,2,2)}(\mathbf{t}) &= \frac{t_0}{\hat{\kappa}_n n^{3/2}} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{c_n} K \left(\frac{X_{j-1} - X_{i-1}}{c_n} \right) \frac{w_n(X_{j-1}) \sigma^2(X_{i-1}) (\varepsilon_i^2 - 1)}{2 \sigma^2(X_{j-1}) f_X(X_{j-1})} \sin(t_0 \varepsilon_j) \varepsilon_j \\ &\quad \times (Y_j(\mathbf{t}) - E[Y_j(\mathbf{t})]) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Recall the definition of $\tilde{S}_n^{(1,2)}$ in Lemma B.3 and note that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{t_0}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{w_n(X_{j-1})}{\hat{\kappa}_n} \sin(t_0 \varepsilon_j) \frac{m - \hat{m}}{\hat{\sigma}}(X_{j-1}) (Y_j(\mathbf{t}) - E[Y_j(\mathbf{t})]) \\ &= \frac{t_0}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{w_n(X_{j-1})}{\hat{\kappa}_n} \sin(t_0 \varepsilon_j) \frac{m - \hat{m}}{\sigma}(X_{j-1}) \frac{\hat{f}_X}{f_X}(X_{j-1}) (Y_j(\mathbf{t}) - E[Y_j(\mathbf{t})]) + R_n^{(1)}(\mathbf{t}) \\ &\quad + R_n^{(2)}(\mathbf{t}) \\ &= \tilde{S}_n^{(1,2,1)}(\mathbf{t}) + R_n^{(1)}(\mathbf{t}) + R_n^{(2)}(\mathbf{t}) + R_n^{(3)}(\mathbf{t}), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} R_n^{(1)}(\mathbf{t}) &= \frac{t_0}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{w_n(X_{j-1})}{\hat{\kappa}_n} \sin(t_0 \varepsilon_j) \frac{\hat{m} - m}{\hat{\sigma}}(X_{j-1}) \frac{\sigma - \hat{\sigma}}{\sigma}(X_{j-1}) (Y_j(\mathbf{t}) - E[Y_j(\mathbf{t})]) \\ R_n^{(2)}(\mathbf{t}) &= \frac{t_0}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{w_n(X_{j-1})}{\hat{\kappa}_n} \sin(t_0 \varepsilon_j) \frac{\hat{m} - m}{\sigma}(X_{j-1}) \frac{f_X - \hat{f}_X}{f_X}(X_{j-1}) (Y_j(\mathbf{t}) - E[Y_j(\mathbf{t})]) \\ R_n^{(3)}(\mathbf{t}) &= \frac{t_0}{\hat{\kappa}_n \sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{w_n(X_{j-1})}{\sigma(X_{j-1})} \sin(t_0 \varepsilon_j) \left(\frac{\frac{1}{nc_n} \sum_{i=1}^n K \left(\frac{X_{j-1} - X_{i-1}}{c_n} \right) (m(X_{i-1}) - m(X_{j-1}))}{f_X(X_{j-1})} \right) \\ &\quad \times (Y_j(\mathbf{t}) - E[Y_j(\mathbf{t})]). \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition B.1 (i) one directly obtains that $\int (R_n^{(j)}(\mathbf{t}))^2 W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t}$ for $j = 1, 2$ is of rate $O_P(n(a_n^*/\Delta_n)^4) = o_P(1)$.

Concerning $\int (R_n^{(3)}(\mathbf{t}))^2 W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t}$ notice that

$$|R_n^{(3)}(\mathbf{t})| \leq D \frac{t_0}{\hat{\kappa}_n \sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{w_n(X_{j-1})}{\sigma(X_{j-1}) f_X(X_{j-1})} \sup_{|x| \leq a_n} \left| \frac{1}{nc_n} \sum_{i=1}^n K \left(\frac{x - X_{i-1}}{c_n} \right) (m(X_{i-1}) - m(x)) \right|$$

uniformly in $\mathbf{t}$ which together with assertion B.1 (ii) implies the rate $\int (R_n^{(3)}(\mathbf{t}))^2 W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t} = O_P(n(\log n)^{4r} (b_n^*)^2) = o_P(1)$, where the latter equality follows from assumption **(A7)**.

Concerning the second term in the definition of $\tilde{S}_n^{(1,2)}$ in Lemma B.3 note that due to $\hat{\sigma} - \sigma = (\hat{\sigma}^2 - \sigma^2)/(\hat{\sigma} + \sigma)$, analogous to before one shows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{t_0}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{w_n(X_{j-1})}{\hat{\kappa}_n} \sin(t_0 \varepsilon_j) \varepsilon_j \frac{\hat{\sigma} - \sigma}{\hat{\sigma}} (X_{j-1})(Y_j(\mathbf{t}) - E[Y_j(\mathbf{t})]) \\ &= \frac{t_0}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{w_n(X_{j-1})}{\hat{\kappa}_n} \sin(t_0 \varepsilon_j) \varepsilon_j \frac{(\hat{\sigma}^2 - \sigma^2) \hat{f}_X}{2\sigma^2 f_X} (X_{j-1})(Y_j(\mathbf{t}) - E[Y_j(\mathbf{t})]) + R_n^{(4)}(\mathbf{t}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\int (R_n^{(4)}(\mathbf{t}))^2 W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t} = o_P(1)$ now follows from Proposition B.1 (i).

To treat the remaining term further we first insert the definition of $\hat{\sigma}^2$ and then use the fact that $m^2 - \hat{m}^2 = 2m(m - \hat{m}) - (m - \hat{m})^2$ and insert the definition of $\hat{m}$. With this one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{t_0}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{w_n(X_{j-1})}{\hat{\kappa}_n} \sin(t_0 \varepsilon_j) \varepsilon_j \frac{(\hat{\sigma}^2 - \sigma^2) \hat{f}_X}{2\sigma^2 f_X} (X_{j-1})(Y_j(\mathbf{t}) - E[Y_j(\mathbf{t})]) \\ &= \tilde{S}_n^{(1,2,2)}(\mathbf{t}) + R_n^{(5)}(\mathbf{t}) + R_n^{(6)}(\mathbf{t}) + R_n^{(7)}(\mathbf{t}) + R_n^{(8)}(\mathbf{t}) - R_n^{(9)}(\mathbf{t}), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} R_n^{(5)}(\mathbf{t}) &= \frac{t_0}{\hat{\kappa}_n n^{3/2}} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{c_n} K \left(\frac{X_{j-1} - X_{i-1}}{c_n} \right) \frac{w_n(X_{j-1})}{2\sigma^2(X_{j-1}) f_X(X_{j-1})} \sin(t_0 \varepsilon_j) \varepsilon_j \\ &\quad \times (\sigma^2(X_{i-1}) - \sigma^2(X_{j-1}))(Y_j(\mathbf{t}) - E[Y_j(\mathbf{t})]) \\ R_n^{(6)}(\mathbf{t}) &= \frac{t_0}{\hat{\kappa}_n n^{3/2}} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{c_n} K \left(\frac{X_{j-1} - X_{i-1}}{c_n} \right) \frac{w_n(X_{j-1})}{2\sigma^2(X_{j-1}) f_X(X_{j-1})} \sin(t_0 \varepsilon_j) \varepsilon_j \\ &\quad \times (m^2(X_{i-1}) - m^2(X_{j-1}))(Y_j(\mathbf{t}) - E[Y_j(\mathbf{t})]) \\ R_n^{(7)}(\mathbf{t}) &= \frac{t_0}{\hat{\kappa}_n n^{3/2}} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{c_n} K \left(\frac{X_{j-1} - X_{i-1}}{c_n} \right) \frac{w_n(X_{j-1})}{\sigma^2(X_{j-1}) f_X(X_{j-1})} \sin(t_0 \varepsilon_j) \varepsilon_j \\ &\quad \times m(X_{j-1})(m(X_{j-1}) - m(X_{i-1}))(Y_j(\mathbf{t}) - E[Y_j(\mathbf{t})]) \\ R_n^{(8)}(\mathbf{t}) &= \frac{t_0}{\hat{\kappa}_n n^{3/2}} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{c_n} K \left(\frac{X_{j-1} - X_{i-1}}{c_n} \right) \frac{w_n(X_{j-1})}{\sigma^2(X_{j-1}) f_X(X_{j-1})} \sin(t_0 \varepsilon_j) \varepsilon_j \\ &\quad \times \sigma(X_{i-1}) \varepsilon_i (m(X_{i-1}) - m(X_{j-1}))(Y_j(\mathbf{t}) - E[Y_j(\mathbf{t})]) \\ R_n^{(9)}(\mathbf{t}) &= \frac{t_0}{\hat{\kappa}_n n^{3/2}} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{c_n} K \left(\frac{X_{j-1} - X_{i-1}}{c_n} \right) \frac{w_n(X_{j-1})}{2\sigma^2(X_{j-1}) f_X(X_{j-1})} \sin(t_0 \varepsilon_j) \varepsilon_j \\ &\quad \times (m(X_{j-1}) - \hat{m}(X_{j-1}))^2 (Y_j(\mathbf{t}) - E[Y_j(\mathbf{t})]) \end{aligned}$$

and one can show $\int (R_n^{(j)}(\mathbf{t}))^2 W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t} = o_P(1)$ completely analogous to the treatment of $R_n^{(3)}$ for $j = 5, 6, 7, 8$ and $R_n^{(1)}$ for $j = 9$. $\square$

Lemma B.5 *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.2 we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \int (\tilde{S}_n^{(1,2,1)}(\mathbf{t}) - \bar{S}_n^{(1,2,1)}(\mathbf{t}))^2 W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t} &= o_P(1) \\ \int (\tilde{S}_n^{(1,2,2)}(\mathbf{t}) - \bar{S}_n^{(1,2,2)}(\mathbf{t}))^2 W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t} &= o_P(1), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{S}_n^{(1,2,1)}(\mathbf{t}) &= \frac{t_0 E[\sin(t_0 \varepsilon_1)]}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n w_n(X_{j-1}) \varepsilon_j (E[Y_j(\mathbf{t})|X_{j-1}] - E[Y_j(\mathbf{t})]) \\ \bar{S}_n^{(1,2,2)}(\mathbf{t}) &= \frac{t_0 E[\sin(t_0 \varepsilon_1) \varepsilon_1]}{2\sqrt{n}} \sum_{j=1}^n w_n(X_{j-1}) (\varepsilon_j^2 - 1) (E[Y_j(\mathbf{t})|X_{j-1}] - E[Y_j(\mathbf{t})]). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We only prove the first assertion, the second one can be shown completely analogous. We have the expansion

$$\tilde{S}_n^{(1,2,1)}(\mathbf{t}) - \bar{S}_n^{(1,2,1)}(\mathbf{t}) = U_n(\mathbf{t}) + t_0 E[\sin(t_0 \varepsilon_1)] V_n(\mathbf{t}),$$

where

$$U_n(\mathbf{t}) = \frac{1}{n^{3/2}} \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi(\mathbf{t}, \varepsilon_i, X_{i-1}, \zeta_j)$$

with $\zeta_j = (X_{j-1}, \dots, X_{j-k})$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\varphi(\mathbf{t}, \varepsilon_i, X_{i-1}, \zeta_j) \\ &= \sigma(X_{i-1}) \varepsilon_i \left(\frac{1}{c_n} K\left(\frac{X_{j-1} - X_{i-1}}{c_n}\right) \frac{w_n(X_{j-1})}{f_X(X_{j-1}) \sigma(X_{j-1})} \sin(t_0 \varepsilon_j) (Y_j(\mathbf{t}) - E[Y_j(\mathbf{t})]) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \int \frac{1}{c_n} K\left(\frac{x - X_{i-1}}{c_n}\right) \frac{w_n(x)}{\sigma(x)} E[\sin(t_0 \varepsilon_1)] (E[Y_j(\mathbf{t})|X_{j-1} = x] - E[Y_j(\mathbf{t})]) dx \right) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$V_n(\mathbf{t}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma(X_{i-1}) \varepsilon_i \int \frac{1}{c_n} K\left(\frac{x - X_{i-1}}{c_n}\right) \left(\frac{w_n(x) \psi(\mathbf{t}, x)}{\sigma(x)} - \frac{w_n(X_{i-1}) \psi(\mathbf{t}, X_{i-1})}{\sigma(X_{i-1})} \right) dx$$

with $\psi(\mathbf{t}, x) = E[Y_i(\mathbf{t})|X_{i-1} = x] - E[Y_i(\mathbf{t})]$. Straightforwardly we obtain negligibility of V_n by considering the expectation

$$\begin{aligned} &E\left[\int t_0^2 V_n^2(\mathbf{t}) W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t} \right] \\ &= \int t_0^2 \int \sigma^2(z) \left(\int \frac{1}{c_n} K\left(\frac{x - z}{c_n}\right) \left(\frac{w_n(x) \psi(\mathbf{t}, x)}{\sigma(x)} - \frac{w_n(z) \psi(\mathbf{t}, z)}{\sigma(z)} \right) dx \right)^2 f_X(z) dz W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the inner integral is zero for $z \notin I_n$. We further separately consider the cases $z \in K_n = [-a_n + c_n C, a_n - c_n C]$ and $z \in I_n \setminus K_n$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& E\left[\int t_0^2 V_n^2(\mathbf{t}) W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t}\right] \\
& \leq \int t_0^2 \left[\int \sigma^2(z) \left(\int \frac{1}{c_n} K\left(\frac{x-z}{c_n}\right) \left(\frac{|\psi(\mathbf{t}, x) - \psi(\mathbf{t}, z)|}{\sigma(x)} + \left| \frac{1}{\sigma(x)} - \frac{1}{\sigma(z)} \right| \right) dx \right)^2 \right. \\
& \quad \times f_X(z) I\{z \in K_n\} dz \\
& \quad \left. + \int \sigma^2(z) \left(\int \frac{1}{c_n} K\left(\frac{x-z}{c_n}\right) \left(\frac{1}{\sigma(x)} + \frac{1}{\sigma(z)} \right) dx \right)^2 f_X(z) I\{z \in I_n \setminus K_n\} dz \right] W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t} \\
& = O((\log n)^{5r} (c_n + c_n^D)) = o(1)
\end{aligned}$$

by assumptions **(A2)** and **(A4)**.

We will now prove $E[\int U_n^2(\mathbf{t}) W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t}] = o(1)$. To this end note that

$$E\left[\int U_n^2(\mathbf{t}) W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t}\right] = \frac{1}{n^3} \sum_{j_1=1}^n \sum_{i_1=1}^n \sum_{j_2=1}^n \sum_{i_2=1}^n E\left[g(\xi_{i_1}, \xi_{i_2}, \xi_{j_1}, \xi_{j_2})\right], \quad (\text{B.5})$$

where $\xi_i = (\varepsilon_i, \zeta_i)$ and

$$g(\xi_{i_1}, \xi_{i_2}, \xi_{j_1}, \xi_{j_2}) = \int \varphi(\mathbf{t}, \varepsilon_{i_1}, X_{i_1-1}, \zeta_{j_1}) \varphi(\mathbf{t}, \varepsilon_{i_2}, X_{i_2-1}, \zeta_{j_2}) W(\mathbf{t}) d\mathbf{t}$$

We first consider the case where all indices i_1, j_1, i_2, j_2 are different. Then the expectation is zero if either i_1 or i_2 is the largest index because $E[\varepsilon_i] = 0$ and ε_i is independent of $\varepsilon_j, X_{i-1}, X_{i-2}, \dots$ (for $j \neq i$). All other cases are treated similarly and thus we only discuss the case $i_1 < i_2 < j_1 < j_2$ in detail. We will apply a version of Lemma 2.1 by Sun and Chiang (1997) for multivariate random variables (see Su and Xiao's (2008) Lemma D.1) in two separate subcases. First let $i_2 - i_1 \geq j_1 - i_2$. Denote by the process ξ_i^* , $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, an independent copy of ξ_i , $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ i.e. a process with the same distributional properties, but independent of the original data. Then $E[g(\xi_{i_1}^*, \xi_{i_2}, \xi_{j_1}, \xi_{j_2})] = 0$ and, for $\delta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& E\left[\left|g(\xi_{i_1}^*, \xi_{i_2}, \xi_{j_1}, \xi_{j_2})\right|^{1+\delta}\right] \\
& \leq k_1 \sup_{x \in [-a_n - Cc_n, a_n + Cc_n]} \sigma^{2+2\delta}(x) \sup_{x \in [-a_n - Cc_n, a_n + Cc_n]} \sigma^{-2-2\delta}(x) E[|\varepsilon_1|^{1+\delta}] \\
& \quad \times E\left[\int \left(\left| \frac{1}{c_n} K\left(\frac{X_{j_1-1} - y}{c_n}\right) \frac{w_n(X_{j_1-1})}{f_X(X_{j_1-1})} \right| + \int \left| \frac{1}{c_n} K\left(\frac{x-y}{c_n}\right) w_n(x) \right| dx \right)^{1+\delta} f_X(y) dy \right. \\
& \quad \left. \times \left(\left| \frac{1}{c_n} K\left(\frac{X_{j_2-1} - X_{i_2-1}}{c_n}\right) \frac{w_n(X_{j_2-1})}{f_X(X_{j_2-1})} \right| + \int \left| \frac{1}{c_n} K\left(\frac{x - X_{i_2-1}}{c_n}\right) w_n(x) \right| dx \right)^{1+\delta} |\varepsilon_{i_2}|^{1+\delta} \right] \\
& \leq k_2 \sup_{x \in [-a_n - Cc_n, a_n + Cc_n]} \sigma^{2+2\delta}(x) \sup_{x \in [-a_n - Cc_n, a_n + Cc_n]} \sigma^{-2-2\delta}(x) \\
& \quad \times \left(\sup_{x \in [-a_n - Cc_n, a_n + Cc_n]} (f_X(x))^{-1-\delta} + 1 \right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\times c_n^{-\delta} E \left[\left(\left| \frac{1}{c_n} K \left(\frac{X_{j_2-1} - X_{i_2-1}}{c_n} \right) \frac{w_n(X_{j_2-1})}{f_X(X_{j_2-1})} \right| + 1 \right)^{1+\delta} |\varepsilon_{i_2}|^{1+\delta} \right]$$

for some constants k_1, k_2 . This is of order $O((\log n)^{\tilde{r}} c_n^{-2\delta})$ for $\tilde{r} = 5r(1+\delta)$ by assumptions **(A2)**–**(A5)**. An application of the aforementioned inequality gives

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{n^3} \sum_{\substack{i_1 < i_2 < j_1 < j_2 \\ i_2 - i_1 \geq j_1 - i_2}} E[g(\xi_{i_1}, \xi_{i_2}, \xi_{j_1}, \xi_{j_2})] \right| &= O((\log n)^{\tilde{r}/(1+\delta)}) \frac{1}{n^3 c_n^{2\delta/(1+\delta)}} \sum_{\substack{i_1 < i_2 < j_1 < j_2 \\ i_2 - i_1 \geq j_1 - i_2}} (\alpha(i_2 - i_1))^{\delta/(1+\delta)} \\ &= O\left(\frac{(\log n)^{5r}}{n c_n^{2\delta/(1+\delta)}}\right) \sum_{j=1}^n j(\alpha(j))^{\delta/(1+\delta)} \\ &\leq o(1) \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} j^{1-\frac{\beta\delta}{1+\delta}} = o(1) \end{aligned}$$

by assumptions **(A1)**, **(A3)** and **(A7)**. Here the mixing coefficient α of ξ_i , $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, is the same as the mixing coefficient of X_i , $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, see Fan and Yao (2003). In the subcase $i_2 - i_1 < j_1 - j_2$ we apply the same inequality but by considering $E[g(\xi_{i_1}^*, \xi_{i_2}^*, \xi_{j_1}, \xi_{j_2})] = 0$ and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{n^3} \sum_{\substack{i_1 < i_2 < j_1 < j_2 \\ i_2 - i_1 \geq j_1 - i_2}} E[g(\xi_{i_1}, \xi_{i_2}, \xi_{j_1}, \xi_{j_2})] \right| &= O((\log n)^{\tilde{r}/(1+\delta)}) \frac{1}{n^3 c_n^{2\delta/(1+\delta)}} \sum_{\substack{i_1 < i_2 < j_1 < j_2 \\ i_2 - i_1 < j_1 - i_2}} (\alpha(j_1 - i_2))^{\delta/(1+\delta)} \\ &= O\left(\frac{(\log n)^{5r}}{n c_n^{2\delta/(1+\delta)}}\right) \sum_{j=1}^n j(\alpha(j))^{\delta/(1+\delta)} = o(1). \end{aligned}$$

For the case $i_1 = i_2$ we exemplarily consider the subcase $i_1 = i_2 < j_1 < j_2$, other subcases are treated similarly. Note that $E[g(\xi_{i_1}, \xi_{i_1}, \xi_{j_1}, \xi_{j_2}^*)] = 0$ by the definition of $\varphi(\cdot)$, and $E[|g(\xi_{i_1}, \xi_{i_1}, \xi_{j_1}, \xi_{j_2}^*)|^{1+\delta}] = O((\log n)^{\tilde{r}} c_n^{-2\delta})$ as before. Thus we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{n^3} \sum_{i_1 < j_1 < j_2} E[g(\xi_{i_1}, \xi_{i_1}, \xi_{j_1}, \xi_{j_2})] \right| &= O((\log n)^{\tilde{r}/(1+\delta)}) \frac{1}{n^3 c_n^{2\delta/(1+\delta)}} \sum_{i_1 < j_1 < j_2} (\alpha(j_2 - j_1))^{\delta/(1+\delta)} \\ &= O\left(\frac{(\log n)^{5r}}{n c_n^{2\delta/(1+\delta)}}\right) \sum_{j=1}^n (\alpha(j))^{\delta/(1+\delta)} = o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, the cases where more than two indices in i_1, i_2, j_1, j_2 are equal always lead to negligible terms by direct calculation. E.g. consider the term for $j_1 = i_1 \neq j_2 = i_2$ in the sum (B.5). Applying assumption **(A2)** its absolute value can straightforwardly be bounded by $n^{-1} O((\log n)^{4r}) (E[|\varepsilon_1|])^2 K^2(0) / c_n^2 = o(1)$ by assumption **(A7)**. The remaining terms are treated analogously. $\square$